REMARKS

With this Response, claims 1, 13, 24, and 29 are amended. No claims are added or canceled. Therefore, claims 1-32 are pending.

<u>REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102</u>

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0019662 of Viswanath et al. (hereinafter "Viswanath"). Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 as amended herein recites a monitor tree of nodes, "wherein each node provides an **individual report of the resource associated with the monitor managed bean of the node**, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources **without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location**...." Claim 2 is a dependent claim of claim 1, and thus includes all features of independent claim 1.

Viswanath discusses a monitoring system for configuration data in a network, where the network is monitored by an administration framework. Applicants note that while there is discussion of how to obtain the data related to the system (i.e., through the central store of configuration data, see Fig. 2), discussion related to the configuration data itself (i.e., relationships among elements of the configuration, see paragraphs [0024], [0025]), and discussion of methods to detect and make configuration changes (see paragraphs [0025], Figs. 7, 8, 11), the reference is noticeably silent with regards to the structure of its monitoring. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose at least "wherein each node provides an **individual report of the resource associated with the monitor managed bean of the node**, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources **without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location**...." Applicants submit that from the text of the reference, one of skill in the art would naturally assume that monitoring is handled according to known techniques of monitoring data being reported to a central location. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest at least one feature of Applicants' claimed invention, and so fails to anticipate the invention as recited in these claims.

Claims 3-7, 13-17 and 24-31

These claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,664,978 of Kekic et al. (hereinafter "Kekic"). Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 recites a monitor tree of nodes, "wherein each node provides an **individual report of the resource associated with the monitor managed bean of the node**, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources **without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location**...."

Claims 13, 24, and 29 are likewise independent claims, and recite similar features.

Likewise discussed above are the defects of Viswanath with respect to these features of Applicants' claim 1. Given the features are also found in the other independent claims, each of the independent claims includes features not disclosed or suggested by Viswanath. Kekic is not cited as curing the deficiencies of Viswanath, and Applicants submit that Kekic fails to cure the deficiencies of Viswanath. Whether or not Kekic discusses hierarchical structures and a navigation tree (see col. 23, lines 4 to 59), Kekic fails to disclose or suggest "wherein each node provides an **individual report of the resource associated with the monitor managed bean of the node**, where the monitor tree enables distributed monitoring of the resources **without requiring all monitoring data to be reported to a central location**...." Applicants do not understand Kekic to disclose or suggest that monitoring data is not required to be reported to a central location. Thus, whether alone or in combination, the references fail to disclose or suggest at least one feature of Applicants' independent claims, and so fail to render obvious the independent claims. MPEP § 2143.

Furthermore, the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth above for the independent claims. MPEP § 2143.03.

Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are not rendered unpatentable over the cited references, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: April 8, 2008

/Vincent H. Anderson/
Vincent H. Anderson
Reg. No. 54,962
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: 4/8/2008

/Katherine Jennings/
Katherine Jennings